

Dr. James M. Beattie, of the University of Edinburgh, reports* the result of some work along the line of investigation undertaken by Beaton and Ainly **MICROCOCCUS RHEUMATICUS.** Walker and reported just a year ago. His results are found to closely approximate those of the previous observers and it would seem probable that the same organism is dealt with in both series of experiments. One of the cultures employed by Beattie was obtained "from the synovial membrane of a girl with acute rheumatism and recovered from the vegetations of an endocarditis in a rabbit." The organism he describes as follows:

"The organism is a small micrococcus which occurs in the tissues and in cultures in pairs or in short chains. Grown in milk bouillon the chains are more definite, but I have never seen chains containing more than a dozen organisms. In size it is smaller than the ordinary streptococcus, and I have never been able to produce in any media the long chains which one so constantly finds in cultures of the streptococcus pyogenes. Many of the organisms, especially those seen in pairs, are rather oval in shape, and more resemble the pneumococcus than the streptococcus. No capsule could be demonstrated. Degeneration forms are fairly common, the coccus becoming swollen and elongated, but even in cultures of several days' growth the infrequency of degeneration forms as compared with those in a growth of streptococcus pyogenes of a similar period is a very striking feature. It stains readily with all the ordinary aniline dyes. It retains the stain by Gram and in Weigert's modification of this method."

The author concludes that the organism described is causal in acute rheumatism, from cases of which it may be isolated and grown on culture media. These conclusions are somewhat at variance with the general opinion of those who have studied the disease in its relation to metabolism and regard it as but one of many possible forms of expression of those conditions of deranged nutrition but little understood. It remains for future study to disclose the relation of the organism in question to rheumatism.

Whether or not the legislators of our state will have time to consider the financial loss occurring from the cutting off in their prime of a large number of our citizens, **TUBERCULOSIS SANATORIA.** remains to be seen. The California Club of San Francisco, acting under the advice of the tuberculosis committee of the State Society, has prepared and presented to the legislature a bill providing for State Sanatoria for the tuberculous poor. Dr. Pottenger, chairman of the committee, has presented some facts in regard to the financial side of this question and Dr. Evans, another member of the committee, has written an article which appeared in the publication of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco along somewhat similar, but more general lines. These two documents emanating from the committee present the whole matter in very simple guise and have been placed in the

hands of all the legislators. As we have said, it is, of course, a problem what they will do in the matter, but the measure appears, in every way, to be so eminently expressive of simple common sense that it should be adopted. The members of the tuberculosis committee are to be congratulated upon their work and their efforts, and equally are the members of the California Club to be highly commended for their action in the matter. Certainly it is to be hoped that the bill will be enacted, and to that end it may with reason be urged upon members of the society that they aid the movement in every way in their power.

At the Atlantic City meeting of the American Medical Association, a member in good standing, and an officer of one of the sections, read **A FEW FACTS.** a paper before that section.*

In the paper a number of notorious nostrums were mentioned and among them seng and chionia. The paper was approved for publication and appeared in the *Journal of the Association*, December 3, 1904. The extent of our present interest in the matter is the presentation of the facts given above and those which follow; we are not concerned directly with the author or with the subject matter of the paper. In the issue of the *Journal* for December 24 is published a letter from the manufacturer of these two nostrums, bitterly attacking the author of the paper referred to—a paper which had been written and read by a member of the Association and "approved for publication." Consider that in connection with the following incident: Most of us know or know of, Dr. G. Frank Lydston. In December, 1903, he wrote a letter to the *Journal* in reply to certain statements which it had published. The nature of the controversy is not material; Dr. Lydston's words are never trivial and are always worth consideration, whether one agrees with his contention or not. Of this communication Dr. Lydston says: "The letter published herewith (privately printed) was sent to the *Journal of the A. M. A.* for publication, and was returned, with the explanation that the editor did 'not see fit to publish it' without alteration. He failed to inform me whether he took exception to the style or to the subject-matter. I saved my ego center from shock by inferring that the subject matter was offensive. The distinguished editor of the *Journal* has adversely criticized my style on several occasions, and another blow would have given me literally a 'finish.' * * * * If the American Medical Association desires the sympathy and co-operation of the medical profession at large, it must avoid partisanry and affronts to the medical rank and file." Are the pages of the *Journal* open to manufacturers to assail and insult members of the Association? Are they not open to members who may wish to voice criticism of the Association, or its *Journal*? Is this sort of "close corporation" policy going to ensure the greatest success for the Association?

* *British Medical Journal*, December 3, 1904.

* The Relation of the Physician to Proprietary Remedies. William J. Robinson. "Approved for publication by the Executive Committee."